

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/04/2015 10:05 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	16
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	16

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - i3 Scale-up Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant 's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

**Reader's Score:**      0

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design and Management Plan**

1. In determining the quality of the project design and management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

(4) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:**      0

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(6) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

The applicants present an adequate evaluation plan that is likely to show evidence of project implementation and effectiveness. Applicants propose to use a randomized cluster trial with random assignment of teachers to treatment within schools which is in alignment with What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards without reservation. The applicants have a strong well established evaluation lead. The proposed project budget appears to be sufficient to carry out the evaluation effectively. The evaluation efforts are embedded in the project timelines that includes project activities and milestones which strengthens all the key components of the evaluation and shows the power of collaboration. The applicants have a solid plan in place to communicate, report, and disseminate evaluation.

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation questions while strong and focused in four different domains (exploratory, implementation, impact, and scale-up) do not align with the project goals and objectives identified on pp. 17-18. The applicants failed to sufficiently address data collection instruments in alignment with project performance measures. The applicants also failed to discuss the potential differential effectiveness of the project and for diverse student populations groups. There are not enough details provided on the power analysis and on how the minimal detectable effect size on page 45 aligns with project impact. The logic model on p. 38 needs further explaining some of the components are unclear. The project outcomes and performance measures identified do not support the project goals and objectives.

**Reader's Score:**      **16**

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 3 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per student costs.
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

**Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**An application addressing this priority must provide**

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;**
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;**
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;**
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and**
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:** 0

**Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 5 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/04/2015 10:05 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 01:52 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	17
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	17

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - i3 Scale-up Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant 's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A



**Reader's Score:**      0

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design and Management Plan**

1. In determining the quality of the project design and management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

(4) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**      0

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(6) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

SRI International will be the external evaluator, with staff experienced in conducting RCTs and QEDs, including the NTC i3 validation grant among other i3 evaluations. As indicated on p. 47 and in the resumes in the appendices, the evaluation team includes both methodological and content experts with extensive experience in teacher development research. Approximately \$2.4M has been allocated for project evaluation over the five-year grant period, appearing to be reasonable and appropriate costs. The evaluation will employ a RCT with clustered random assignment to assign schools within sites to either the NTC induction model (treatment) or to the existing induction practices (control), blocking on school level (elementary, middle and high) and should meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. The study will follow two cohorts of new teachers over the two-year program across five sites. Data on both teacher and student outcomes will be collected. Different mentoring strategies and their impact will also be examined, including part time released mentors, integration of technology, and the use of a demonstration site, as these may better meet the needs of certain districts or schools as opposed to full time released mentors and strictly one-on-one, face-to-face mentoring. The applicant's logic model (p. 38) shows the connections among the inputs such as contextual factors, the NTC induction model, and the expected outcomes for teachers and students. The applicant will investigate research questions related to project impact, implementation, and scale-up, and discusses in detail the data collection procedures to be employed to respond to each question on pp. 39-43. For example, two teacher outcome measures (classroom teaching and retention) will be assessed using (1) an externally validated observation instrument, pre and post, and blind to treatment or control condition; and (2) annual human resources data from partner sites to determine which teachers return to their schools or districts the following year. Data analysis is also discussed in detail on pp. 43-46, including the analysis of the effect of the project on student achievement and teacher outcomes. Formal reporting of evaluation results will be on an annual basis with informal formative feedback provided on qualitative data from interviews and observations (p. 46).

**Weaknesses:**

Although student demographics from participating districts reported by the applicant indicate considerable student diversity, the applicant does not include a discussion about obtaining information about the potential differential effectiveness of the project for diverse student populations such as ELL and low-income students. More detail is needed on the power analysis used to calculate the MDSE.

**Reader's Score:** 17

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 3 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per student costs.
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

**Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**An application addressing this priority must provide**

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;**
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;**

(3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;

(4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach;  
and

(5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**      0

#### **Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices**

##### **1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 5 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**      0

---

**Status:**              Submitted

**Last Updated:**    09/01/2015 01:52 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2015 05:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	8
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	32
<b>Quality of Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	70
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	5
<b>Total</b>	108	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - i3 Scale-up Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

#### Strengths:

The applicant provided strong evidence to show that the project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on alternatives to existing strategies. This is demonstrated by the applicant writing that NTC's TI model is substantively different from the often-unfunded mentoring models that are common default in school districts today. This project involves building on existing strategies by implementing NTC's TI model, which has been designed over the past 17 years in partnership with hundreds of school districts across the nation, focusing on strengthening new and veterans teachers' practice by developing veteran teacher leaders as exemplary mentors who work 1:1 with new teachers. (pp. 2)

The applicant shows clear details to support the potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies in a variety of settings. For example, the applicant discussed that NTC has successfully demonstrated the ability to expand its program reach, growing from a small organization supporting 1,000 new teachers in 1998 to a nationally recognized non-profit with a \$41.6 million budget supporting nearly 26,000 teachers and increasing the learning of nearly 1.8 million students during the 2013-14 school year. Replicability is also discussed by the applicant writing that this flexibility allows LEAs across the country to fit the NTC model within their context, without losing the impact or financial return on investment for teachers and students. (pp. 3, 4)

The applicant provided clear details to show that the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available. For example, the applicant wrote that this project focuses specifically on accelerating the effectiveness of new teachers, as research demonstrates that many new teachers are not as effective as prepare their students to succeed. The applicant also shows a need for access to quality induction supports for teachers in schools with the highest concentrations of high need students since significantly lower participation rates in induction are reported for these schools as compared to their counterparts in more affluent schools. The applicant clearly shows that the challenge is that a partial cause for this climate of poor induction is the absence of comprehensive state induction policies. On the national front, single-year induction programs don't improve teacher practice, yet 16 of the 27 states with induction requirements define it as a one-year program, and even less require dedicated time for mentoring. (pp. 5)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide details to show which of the schools discussed are part the targeted schools mentioned in this project.

**Reader's Score:** 8

**Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale**

1. In determining the applicant 's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided compelling evidence to show the extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application. This is demonstrated by the applicant discussing that Denver Public Schools, Colorado (DPS hires 380 teachers per year and estimates an annual new teacher turnover rate of 28%. DPS has a well-documented emphasis of success on differentiated teacher leadership roles to extend the reach of effective teachers and create communities where teachers can lead. The applicant suggests that this success of a scale-up comes from NTC's model that promotes differentiated roles for teachers and is greatly aligned with DPS in the desire to promote mentoring for new teachers as an essential system of support. (pp. 7) ((

The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which grant funds will be used to address barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application. For example, the applicant discussed that this grant provides NTC a unique opportunity to address the following barriers to reaching the level of scale proposed in this project. Barriers addressed by the applicant include isolated programming, lack of data to drive programming and dissemination, inefficient local customization, and limited induction awareness. (pp. 8-13)

The applicant clearly details the mechanisms they will use to broadly disseminate information on its project to support further development or replication. For example, the applicant wrote that there will use several mechanisms to broadly disseminate this information across the field to further support replication. This can be seen by the applicant writing that not only will the grant affect at least 116,000 students, but because the LEA partners represent California, Colorado, Florida, New York, key states for national education policy, the success of the comprehensive, job-embedded model will receive prominent national exposure. The applicant also demonstrated their plans to broadly disseminate information on their project by discussing that the proposed project is also likely to yield findings, tools, and resources that will be used by other agencies and organizations due to NTC's vast network of education partner organizations across the nation. (pp. 15, 16)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did discuss which barriers in the past are going to be addressed, however there are few details to show the purpose and expected outcomes from addressing these barriers. (

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design and Management Plan

**1. In determining the quality of the project design and management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.**

**(4) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. For example, the applicant discussed that their goal will be to build LEA capacity to support programming and develop teacher leaders. The outcome for this goal is that partner sites will present NTX curriculum in years 2 and 3. To show their outcomes to be proposed will be measurable the applicant wrote that from the start of the partnership with these LEAs, NTC will provide a dedicated portal into NTC's Learning Zone, and this resource will support LEAs' growing capacity to implement the program independently and sustain it at a high level through ongoing formative data review and programmatic adjustments, based on data. (pp. 17, 18)

The applicant clearly shows the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. This is demonstrated by the applicant discussing that NTC has gone from managing a handful of induction engagements in 1998 to managing over 400 per year in 2015. The applicant also provided additional support to show the adequacy of their management plan to achieve their objectives by writing that they will provide technical assistance to support implementation of the NTC induction model; transfer ownership of implementation to the LEAs along with a 5 year timeline and the responsibility of Site Leadership. The applicant provides a table with information showing activities, milestone and responsible persons that demonstrate that the project will occur on time and within the budget. (pp. 26, 30)

There are compelling details provided by the applicant that shows clarity and coherence of their multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level during the project period. This can be seen by the applicant providing a table with a five-year plan for activities and milestones. For example, each year the applicant plans to disseminate results and learnings via social media, conferences, and digital stories at least 2 quarters each year for 5 years. (pp. 31, 32) ((

The applicant provides clear details to show their adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. This is shown by the applicant discussing that in order to provide ongoing feedback for improvement, NTC supports partners through the use of formative feedback, performance metrics and benchmarks, and summative data. The applicant also further discussed that formative feedback occurs through the frequent meetings between program leads, lead mentors, and mentors. The applicant also discussed their methods for data collection and how this data will be collected and used to set the agenda for bi-monthly mentor forums that focus on relevant problems of practice from the field ensuring an evidence based and real time approach to new teacher support. (pp. 34)



**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide sufficient details to show a multiyear financial plan.

**Reader's Score:** 30

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(6) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:** 0

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity**

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 3 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

(a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.

(b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per student costs.

(c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**An application addressing this priority must provide**

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;**
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;**
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;**
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and**
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.**

**Strengths:**

N/A- The applicant chose not to address this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A- The applicant chose not to address this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score:      0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 5 points)**

**Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:**

**(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.**

**(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.**

**(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.**

**(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly addressed Competitive Preference Priority 2 by writing that NTC and its six LEA partners will build their capacity to replicate and sustain NTC's research-based Teacher Induction ("TI") Model across 4 states. The applicant also provide further support for CPP 2 by discussing that NTC has an explicit goal around dissemination of best practices to the policy community. Additionally, NTC has identified Broward County Public Schools which is a current NTC induction partner to serve as a demonstration site to other LEAs, and has also set forth additional scale-up strategies.

(pp. 1)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**     5

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**    09/02/2015 05:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2015 06:45 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	9
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	31
<b>Quality of Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	34
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	74
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	5
<b>Total</b>	108	79

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - i3 Scale-up Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

#### Strengths:

The applicant's model of mentoring is demonstrably superior to other mentoring approaches, e.g. "teacher buddy," in duration, mentor training, evident value to inductee, and performance results (pp.3-4). The validation study demonstrated effectiveness of the model in terms of teacher retention and performance. Capacity to replicate the project is evident from validate study and history of prior dissemination efforts. The challenge of teacher turnover and career effectiveness is acute, particularly in hard-to-staff settings (p.5).

#### Weaknesses:

The assertion that single year induction does not suffice was not documented.

Reader's Score: 9

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant 's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

Demand by client districts is evident in teacher staffing data. The use of one large client as a demonstration site should underscore efficacy of the model to prospective districts. Assessment tools (FAS system p. 10, Learning Zone, p. 10) should serve to communicate program efficacy to client districts. The on-line community should also facilitate expansion (for a, p. 12).

**Weaknesses:**

Demand for the service external to existing partners is not well supported. Some settings discontinued induction due to the lack of a supportive policy environment.

**Reader's Score:** 31

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design and Management Plan**

1. In determining the quality of the project design and management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

(4) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

Applicant demonstrates a highly nuanced understanding of managerial complexities of the proposed project with thorough descriptions of professional development, human resource, and policy issues. Goals and outcomes include highly significant student outcome measures. Regional approach and client support mechanisms are detailed and promising (NTC plans). Professional development enhancements should support scale up. The program quality review tool should lead to continuous improvement based on feedback.

**Weaknesses:**

More attention to the long term funding model beyond the period of funding would strengthen the application.

**Reader's Score:** 34

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (2) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.
- (5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.
- (6) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**      0

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 3 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per student costs.
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the

practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach;  
and

(5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:** 0

### Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 5 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

**Strengths:**

Broad adoption capacity is demonstrated by an exemplary mix of high quality professional development, network delivered services, involvement in policy support for the intervention, and plans to codify and enhance practice during scale up.

**Weaknesses:**

none

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/03/2015 06:45 PM





Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2015 06:19 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	7
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	31
<b>Quality of Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	31
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	69
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	5
<b>Total</b>	108	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - i3 Scale-up Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411A150005)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

#### Strengths:

- o The applicant proposes a plan to implement the development of veteran teacher leaders as exemplary mentors, different from traditional means of matching a veteran teacher to a new teacher with little or no coaching training for their mentorship roles. (p2)
- o NTC past success provides a strong background for building capacity to complete the proposed project. One example is the implementation mentors as an on-the-job professional development for new teachers, is a strong component of this proposal and intends to strengthen leadership skills of veteran teachers. (p2) Additionally, the classroom mentors will facilitate and strengthen teacher understanding of content that is new or not within their previous training. (p5)
- o Growth from 1,000 teachers to the current number of 26,000 is significant. (p3)
- o The applicant shows that there is a national need for the project based on poverty-stricken schools that employ new teachers who may or may not have the background knowledge to adequately fulfill their teaching assignment. The proposal addresses this need through mentorship and job-embedded professional development. (p5)

#### Weaknesses:

- o The proposal needs to include more detail regarding changes that are required to meet the needs of various demographics.
- o Although the growth described in the application is significant, the applicant does not fully explain how NTC grew from 1,000 teachers to 26,000 teachers trained. (p3)

Reader's Score: 7

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant 's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

**(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

**(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.**

**(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

**Strengths:**

- o The applicant utilizes a school that has measurable success with NTC as demonstration sites. This first-hand experience will facilitate a better understanding of the grant programs for other NTC participants, helping to meet the demand for this practice. (p6)
- o Because the turnover of teachers, in the LEA schools, is so high (27% to 56%), there is clearly a demand for induction programs and practices. (p7)
- o The applicant identifies model schools who have supported mentor roles, so that they are sustained by the school district, without the reliance on grant funding. (p8-9) This solves the barrier of the induction program existing short term and eliminated without funding support.
- o The second barrier is addressed with the demonstration site, a role model for schools embarking on this grant program. (p9)
- o Using technology formats to collaborate over multiple NTC sites somewhat reduces the barrier of factors related to travel distances and time to accommodate meetings. (p13)
- o The applicant includes technology that will help identify teacher effectiveness and student learning from this project. The alignment to CCSS standards is a strength of this proposal because it shows that all NTC project teachers will be expected to meet the same level of success. (p10)
- o The dissemination plan is strong because it contains multiple venues for delivering information regarding the NTC plan. These include the demonstration site, web-based resources, National Induction Symposium, and media coverage in prominent publications. (p17) The applicant's strategic communication plan has the potential to reach educators on a national scale, making it relevant to a variety of locations. (p17)

**Weaknesses:**

- o Although the school districts are committed to improving teacher retention, specific plans for meeting this need are not clearly explained. (p6-8)

**Reader's Score: 31**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design and Management Plan**

**1. In determining the quality of the project design and management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.**

**(4) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

- o Goals and objectives have clear strategies for success and measurability. (p17-19) See Logic Model (p19)
- o NTC has an established presence (including qualified full time staff) in multiple locations, making it feasible to accommodate the needs of this project on a national and regional level. (p33)
- o The use of formative feedback in the electronic format makes it useful to all participants. This strengthens the opportunity for continuous improvement and strong communication among participants. (p34)

**Weaknesses:**

- o Philanthropic funding is mentioned, but a firm commitment from these agencies is missing. (p34)
- o Some multi-year funding is listed, but it may not be sufficient to sustain the project beyond the term of the grant funds.

**Reader's Score: 31**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

**(2) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.**

**(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**

**(5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**(6) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:**      0

## **Priority Questions**

### **Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity**

#### **1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 3 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

(a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.

(b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per student costs.

(c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

**Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**An application addressing this priority must provide**

(1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;

(2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;

(3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;

(4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and

(5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not address this priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this priority.

**Reader's Score:**      0

### **Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices**

#### **1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 5 points)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice),

and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

**Strengths:**

: The applicant identifies a holistic approach to meeting the needs of teachers and students. Through their commitment to improve instructional practice of teachers and teacher retention, the applicant demonstrates a solid plan to prepare teachers for their classroom assignments. NTC's Teacher Induction program is comprehensive and based on their Logic Model that has documented success. (p e14) NTC also intends to not only replicate their current model, but enhance it to a sustainable model across the 4 participating states. (p1) The establishment of a demonstration site will facilitate the applicant's dissemination plan by enabling potential users to obtain first-hand information from educators who use and succeed with the NTC initiatives. (p17-18) The proposal includes a plan to develop materials that can be used in schools funded through this grant as well as duplicated for additional schools beyond the grant timeline. The applicant outlines a clear and concise curriculum for each of the three project years. This plan contains a curricular progression that meets the needs of teachers beginning with instructional mentoring and formative assessments, implementing inquiry into practice and serving students equitably using appropriate tools and strategies. By year 3 teachers will be able to critique each other's lesson models and explore opportunities to serve as leaders in their schools. (Appendix J) This comprehensive professional progression is replicable and adaptable to any student population of diverse learners. (p e153) The Teacher Induction model is research based with an explicit goal of dissemination best practices to multiple communities (p 1).

**Weaknesses:**

Web-based means for disseminating the project to new schools is good, but there is no identified way to inform potential users of this tool, nor is there funding planned to support its implementation.

**Reader's Score:**      **5**

---

**Status:**                Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      09/03/2015 06:19 PM